

NOTES ON LEPIDOPTERA.

BY W. J. HOLLAND, LL.D., F.Z.S., &c.

The species named *Lycæna fuliginosa* by Mr. W. H. Edwards and as such listed in his Catalogue of the Butterflies of North America, published as an Appendix to the First Volume of the Butterflies of North America, has been in the Catalogue annexed to Volume II transferred to the genus *Thecla*. This is a palpable error, as an examination of the types reveals. I called the attention of Dr. Skinner to this fact long ago, and recently upon the occasion of a short visit paid me by Mr. Beutenmuller, I likewise called his attention to it. The fact seems to be worthy of publication. Edwards was right in his original location of the species. The upper side is of a uniform grayish brown and the markings of the underside as well as the form of the wings are of a truly lycænine character.

Entomologists have been puzzled for many years past by their failure to discover anywhere within the limits of the United States specimens of the species named *Pamphila omaha* by Mr. W. H. Edwards. The original description, which appeared in the Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Philadelphia, Vol. II, p. 21, stated that the type came from "Pike's Peak" and was contained in the collection of Mr. Newman, of Philadelphia, the well known collector, of whom the writer cherishes pleasant memories. In a letter recently received from Mr. Edwards he tells me that the specimens were collected by Mr. William Wood. Wood, I am informed, was a taxidermist, who also traded in a small way in insects, and had a lot of miscellaneous stuff in his shop coming from all sorts of places. He was not at all careful, so I am told, and but little dependence could be placed upon his locality labels, which were as likely to be incorrect as correct.

After Mr. Edwards had written his original description of *P. omaha* he returned the types to their owner. If I am not mistaken they are contained at present in the collection of the American Entomological Society of Philadelphia. At all events, two specimens labelled *Pamphila omaha* Edwards, are to be found there, corresponding perfectly with the description given by Edwards. They are mounted on common pins, not insect pins.

In the Edwards Collection there is a single specimen of *Pamphila omaha*, marked "*P. omaha*, = *mingo*, Edw., Kanawha Co., W. Va." Mr. Edward writes me that so far as he is able to recall the facts this specimen, which is the original type of his *Pamphila mingo*, was taken,

as the label states, in Kanawha County. He tells me that having returned the types of *P. omaha*, he fell inadvertently into the error of re-describing the species three years afterwards under the new name.

In my studies of the Hesperiidæ I have been led to amass an exceedingly large collection of the Hesperiidæ of the world, and the other day Dr. Barnes, who was with me spending a little time in the examination of the Edwards Collection, called my attention to the obvious identity of *P. omaha* with the East Indian *Telicota mæsoides* Butler, of which I possess a large series of specimens. I had not noted the fact before, but, when my attention was called to it, the positive identity of the two things became at once manifest.

I strongly suspect that *Pamphila omaha* Edwards is not a native of this country. If we had only to do with the types originally acquired by Mr. Newman from William Wood I should have no hesitation whatever in saying that we are dealing with an error brought about by a mistaken locality-label. The assertion of Mr. Edwards that the type of *P. mingo* was taken in Kanawha County is the great obstacle to such a conclusion. Still it is possible that Mr. Edwards was mistaken also.

Elwes in his recent Revision of the Oriental Hesperiidæ, published in the Transactions of the Zoological Society of London, Vol. XIV, p. 254, gives the synonymy of the species. I reproduce it here, intercalating the additional synonyms of American origin:

***Telicota dara* Kollar.**

Hesperia dara KOLLAR, Hugel's Kaschmir. Vol. IV, p. 455 (1848).

Hesperia omaha W. H. EDWARDS, Proc. Ent. Soc. Phil. Vol. II, p. 21 (1863).

Pamphila mesa MOORE, P. Z. S., 1865, p. 509, Pl. XXV, fig. 9.

Hesperia mingo W. H. EDWARDS, Proc. Ent. Soc. Phil. Vol. VI, p. 207 (1866).

Pamphila flava MURRAY, Ent. M. Mag. XII, p. 4 (1875).

Pamphila nitida MABILLE, Pet. Nouv. II, p. 114 (1877).

Pamphila taxilus MABILLE, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg. XXI, p. 38 (1878).

Carterocephalus omaha STRECKER, Butt. and Moths of N. A. p. 175 (1878).

Pamphila trachala MABILLE, Pet. Nouv. II, p. 237 (1878).

Pamphila mæsoides BUTLER, Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond. Ser. 2, Zool. Vol. I, p. 554 (1879).

Padraona mæsoides MOORE, Lep. Ceylon, I, p. 171, Pl. LXXI, figs. 5, 5a (1881).

Carterocephalus omaha EDWARDS, Butt, N. A. Appendix (1884).

Telicota mæsoides DISTANT, Rhop. Malay. p. 383, Pl. XXXIV, fig. 24 (1886).

Padraona pseudomæsa MOORE, Lep. Ceylon, I, p. 170 (1881).

Padraona dara WATSON, Hesp. Ind. p. 57 (1891).

Padraona dara LEECH, Butt. China etc. p. 596, pl. XL, figs 13, 14, vars. (1891).

Pamphila heterus MABILLE, Compt. Rend. Soc. Ent. Belg. III, no. 31, p. 72 (1883).

Pamphila heterus STAUDINGER, Iris, II, p. 145 (1889).

Padraona heterus SEMPER, Schmett. Philipp. p. 303, Pl. XLIX, fig. 15, ♀ (1892).

Whether all of the several forms thus merged under *Telicota dara* Kollar, are positively identical may perhaps be questioned a little, but of the identity of *T. omaha*, with the form described as *P. masoides* by Butler there is not a shadow of doubt.

Mr. Elwes, in his revision of the Hesperiidæ of the Oriental Region referred to in the foregoing paragraph, describes as a new species a *Telicota* to which he gives the name of *simplex* (Cf. p. 253, Pl. XIX, Fig. 15, ♂). This is the same species which I described in the Proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural History, Vol. XXV, p. 79, Pl. IV, fig. 4, under the name *Telicota subrubra*. I do not much wonder that from the wretched figure I gave, Elwes was unable to make out the species, and I am thankful to him for having given so good a figure. Of course, his name sinks as a synonym. Had he noted my description and asked for information as he did in reference to some other species, I might have helped him to avoid the error. His work is a splendid contribution to our knowledge of the subject, and minor errors of this sort are likely to occur in the case of the most careful student.

Much has been written concerning *Limenitis floridensis* Strecker, and *Limenitis eros* W. H. Edwards. The latter author insists upon the distinctness of his species from that named by Strecker. I cannot agree with him. With the type of *L. eros* before me, and after having carefully examined the insect named *L. floridensis* by Strecker, I am sure of the identity of the two. Strecker's name has priority.

What is *Zeuzera canadensis* Herrich-Schaeffer? Under this name the distinguished lepidopterist of Ratisbon named and figured a species of *Zeuzera*, which, he informs us, came from "Quebeck" (*sic*). From the time of the publication of his plate to this present hour no such insect has turned up on American soil. I recently purchased, while in London, a set of a *Zeuzera* from Natal, which is undoubtedly the insect figured by Cramer as *Noctua asylas* (Pap. Exot., Pl. 137, fig. C). Is not this species of Cramer the same as the one figured by Herrich-Schaeffer? It looks to me as if possibly *Z. canadensis* might be an African form, and that we are dealing in this case again with a mistaken locality-label. *Quien sabe?* *

* I was tempted to drop a line to Dr. A. G. Butler of the British Museum requesting him to confer with Sir George F. Hampson and let me know whether my